

**CC:DA TASK FORCE ON RDA INSTRUCTIONS FOR  
GOVERNMENTAL AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL CORPORATE BODIES**

**ALA MIDWINTER 2012 DISCUSSION PAPER  
DECEMBER 16, 2011**

Submitted by Kevin M. Randall (chair) on behalf of the Task Force: Penny Baker, Elizabeth Mangan, Robert Maxwell, Betsy Moon, Karen Weaver, Paul Weiss.

**INTRODUCTION**

The CC:DA Task Force on RDA Instructions for Governmental and Non-governmental Corporate Bodies will be presenting a formal report and proposal to CC:DA in spring 2012. This is not that document, but is only an informal update to inform the CC:DA of some of the more significant issues we are considering and for which we desire input from the committee at large.

**THE CHARGE OF THE TASK FORCE**

The CC:DA Task Force on RDA Instructions for Governmental and Non-governmental Corporate Bodies is charged with reviewing the current RDA instructions in Chapter 11 on names of government bodies and other corporate bodies — with particular attention to the instructions on the names of bodies entered subordinately in 11.2.2.13–11.2.2.20 — to address previously identified concerns of ALA that “having separate instructions for government bodies and other corporate bodies introduces both redundancy and complexity” (6JSC/Sec/1, p. 23). The task force should look broadly at issues relating to the recording of corporate hierarchies in preferred names and access points, and should recommend a solution that is consistent, rational, and principle-based, generating appropriate rules revisions.

**PRINCIPLES**

In order to evaluate the current instructions and any suggested revisions, it is necessary to understand the underlying principles for forming preferred names. There are two stated principles in RDA that apply to corporate body names:

**Differentiation** (RDA 0.4.3.1): "The data describing an entity ... should differentiate that entity from other entities, and from other identities used by the same entity."

**Representation** (RDA 0.4.3.4): "The name or form of name designated as the preferred name for a ... corporate body should be the name or form of name most commonly found in resources associated with that ... corporate body, or a well-accepted name or form of name in the language and script preferred by the agency creating the data. ..."

These two principles are not sufficient to support the instructions for the types of subordinate bodies in 11.2.2.14 and 11.2.2.19. Examination of the instructions and the examples leads to the discovery of at least two other possible principles:

**Parentage:** Indicate the larger body to which the body in question is subordinate.

**Collocation:** Facilitate sorting of names into rough hierarchical order.

These principles are evident in long-standing conventions for the treatment of subordinate body names, not only in library catalogs but also in other resources such as directories. However, the principle of Collocation does at times conflict with the principle of Representation.

Most of the types can be seen to be supported by one or more of the above principles. (Types 1-5 listed below are described in the terminology of the general instructions in 11.2.2.14, with any significant differences pertaining to government bodies in 11.2.2.19 mentioned in a note.)

Type 1: A name containing a term that by definition implies that the body is part of another (e.g., *Department, Division, Section, Branch*).

Entry is subordinate regardless of the uniqueness of the name or indication of the parent body. The driving principle appears to be **Collocation**.

Type 2: A name containing a word that normally implies administrative subordination (e.g., *Committee, Commission*) provided that the name of the higher body is required for the identification of the subordinate body.

Entry is subordinate only when the name doesn't indicate the parent body. The driving principle appears to be **Parentage**. (The committees of a body may or may not collocate under that body, depending on how the names are presented.)

Type 3: A name that is general in nature or that does no more than indicate a geographic, chronological, or numbered or lettered subdivision of a parent body.

Entry is subordinate only when the name is "generic". The driving principle appears to be **Parentage**. (The subdivisions of a body may or may not collocate under that body, depending on how the names are presented.)

Type 4: A name that does not convey the idea of a corporate body.

Since there are other ways conveying the idea of a corporate body (such as the addition of a qualifier), the driving principle appears to be **Parentage**. (The government counterpart instruction includes the provision "and does not contain the name of the government".)

Type 5 (11.2.2.14 only): A name of a university faculty, school, college, institute, laboratory, etc., that simply indicates a particular field of study.

Entry is subordinate only when the name is "generic"; schools that are named but don't include the name of the parent body are entered under their own names (e.g., John F. Kennedy School of Government, which is part of Harvard University). The driving principle appears to be **Differentiation**.

Type 5 (11.2.2.19 only): An agency that is a ministry or similar major executive agency (i.e., one that has no other agency above it) as defined by official publications of the government in question.

The driving principle appears to be **Collocation**.

Type 6 (11.2.2.14 only): A name that includes the entire name of the higher or related body.

This type does not seem to be supported by any of the principles. Whether or not a name falls into type 6 is sometimes determined by which place on the resource the cataloger takes the name from, and/or how the cataloger is interpreting the layout, typography, etc. This type may also "catch" names that fail the tests of other types; for example, the name "Committee on Accreditation of the American Library Association" fails the type 2 test but passes the type 6 test, whereas "ALA Committee on Minority Concerns" fails both.

The remaining types under 11.2.2.19 for government bodies all refer also to later special rules, and all appear to have **Collocation** as their driving principle:

Type 6: A legislative body (see also 11.2.2.22).

Type 7: A court (see also 11.2.2.24).

Type 8: A principal service of the armed forces of a government (see also 11.2.2.25).

Type 9: A head of state or head of government (see also 11.2.2.21).

Type 10: An embassy, consulate, etc. (see also 11.2.2.26).

Type 11: A delegation to an international or intergovernmental body (see also 11.2.2.27).

## ISSUES UNDER CONSIDERATION

### Type 6 (General)

Difficulties with type 6 arose when making attempts to consolidate the two lists of subordinate body types. It is a difficult case because it does not apply to *government* bodies. Because this type is in effect so arbitrary, it appears to flout the principle of Representation for no apparent purpose. It does not serve to differentiate from other bodies, to identify the parent body, or to collocate types of subordinate bodies. The task force is considering making a proposal to eliminate type 6. Working from all of the examples under the current instruction, we would expect this scenario to result in the following kinds of names:

American Legion Auxiliary  
*not* American Legion. Auxiliary

Agricultural Experiment Station of Auburn University  
*not* Auburn University. Agricultural Experiment Station

Friends of the Dunedin Botanic Garden  
*not* Dunedin Botanic Garden. Friends

Annual Meeting of the International Whaling Commission  
*not* International Whaling Commission. Annual Meeting

General Conference of the United Methodist Church  
*not* United Methodist Church (U.S.). General Conference

Brock University Philosophical Society  
*not* Brock University. Philosophical Society

University of Vermont Choral Union  
*not* University of Vermont. Choral Union

St. John's College Library  
*not* St. John's College (University of Oxford). Library

BBC Symphony Orchestra  
*unchanged*

Friends of the Corcoran  
*unchanged*

Utah Museum of Fine Arts  
*unchanged*

CU-Boulder Alumni Association  
*unchanged*

The task force would be most helped by having CC:DA consider the following questions:  
Would the elimination of type 6 be problematic in any way? Would it be desirable to add more words to type 1, such as "Meeting" or "Conference"? Are there any problems with types 1-5 that need to be addressed?

### **Direct or indirect subdivision**

The current instructions in 11.2.2.15 and 11.2.2.20 call for subordinated names to be entered under the lowest unit entered recorded directly under its own name (for general bodies) or under the name of the government (for government bodies), unless the name has been, or is likely to be, used by another body in the same hierarchy, in which case the lowest unit required to make a

distinction is interposed. The task force considered having names be entered under the complete hierarchy of higher body names. However, further consultation and discussion revealed that catalogers may have difficulty determining the exact hierarchy. Moreover, it is not at all uncommon for lower unit names to remain constant while the higher units change frequently, sometimes even annually. Even if a succession of authority records could be devised and maintained, there could be a severe adverse effect on serial treatment of such things as committee reports. While the current instructions require the cataloger to make a judgment as to the uniqueness of the subordinate body's name in the organizational hierarchy, it appears that this is preferable to the potential work required to put the entire hierarchy into the established name. There is currently no plan to propose any change to current practice.

### **Political parties**

11.2.2.17, dealing with state or local units of political parties, is limited to parties in the United States. The task force sees no reason why this should not be generalized.

### **Legislative subcommittees**

11.2.2.22.2-3 have a legislative subcommittee put under the legislature or chamber, unless it is in the U.S. Congress, in which case it is put under the committee to which it is subordinate. Since the name "subcommittee" (or its equivalent) has the implication of subordination built right into it, the task force is leaning toward generalizing the 11.2.2.22.3 so it applies to all subcommittees, not just those in the United States.

### **Courts**

The principle of **Collocation** at play in 11.2.2.24 can cause significant distortion of the name of a court. Often, part of the name is removed only to be added back in as a qualifier. For example:

France. Cour d'appel (Grenoble)  
name: Cour d'appel de Grenoble

United Kingdom. Crown Court (Manchester)  
name: Manchester Crown Court  
[example from AACR2; included to show a case where the subordinated form starts with a different word than the first word in the actual name]

### **Religious bodies**

Is it necessary to have all of the special rules for religious bodies spelled out in 11.2.2.28-31? Would there be value in generalizing these as well?